

REMARKS

Claims 1-92 remain pending in the Application. Claims 1, 20, 39, 55, and 74 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 15, 34, 50, 69, and 88. Claims 15, 34, 50, 69, and 88 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative thanks Examiner Hu and Supervisor Orgad for the courtesy of telephonic interviews held on September 20, 2007.

Applicants' representative and Examiner Hu discussed the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and the rejection of claim 15 under 103(a). With respect to claim 15, the Examiner acknowledged that Gabara fails to show at least Applicants' claimed variable-gain amplifier. Applicants' representative explained that the Examiner's stated rationale did not support incorporating Applicants' variable-gain amplifier into Gabara's design, because applying a gain to signals internal to Gabara's filter would introduce errors into Gabara's frequency tuning algorithm. The Examiner agreed that this appeared to be the case. The Examiner further agreed that claim 1 would be allowable over Gabara if claim 1 were amended to include the limitations of claim 15. Applicants have made this amendment. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1, as currently presented, is allowable over Gabara for at least these reasons.

Applicants' representative and Supervisor Orgad discussed the rejection of claims 19, 38, 54, 73, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. These claims recite compliance with particular IEEE standards. The Examiner's stated basis for this rejection was that the scope of the invention could not be determined from the claim language because IEEE standards may change over time. Applicants' representative pointed out that the claimed IEEE standards refer to the standards in place as of the Application's filing date, and therefore the scope of the invention *can* be determined with particularity from the claim language. Supervisor Orgad agreed, and stated that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn. Applicants therefore request that the rejection of claims 19, 38, 54, 73, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 19, 38, 54, 73, and 92 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite and failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 19, 38, 54, 73 and 92 recite compliance with particularly identified IEEE standards. For example, claim 19 recites that “the filter calibration circuit is compliant with any of IEEE standards 802.11, 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11c, 802.11g, 802.11h, 802.11i, 802.11n, and 802.16.” The Examiner rejected these claims, stating that “protocols and standards change over time, hence, it is inappropriate to have the scope of a claim change with time. . . If the standard changes, the disclosure may no longer support the limitation.” As discussed above, however, the claimed standards refer to the versions of those standards that were in place as of the Application’s filing date, April 21, 2004. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19, 38, 54, 73 and 92 are not indefinite. Applicants thank Supervisor Orgad for his agreement on this point and request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-14, 16-18, 20-33, 35-37, 39-49 and 51-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,307,443 B1 (“Gabara”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

a. Claim 1 and its dependent claims

Claim 1 as amended is directed to a filter calibration circuit including a comparator, a calibration logic unit, a DC voltage source, and a variable-gain amplifier. The comparator generates a comparator output based on a filter output amplitude signal and a reference amplitude signal, the filter output amplitude signal corresponding to an amplitude of an output signal produced by a filter circuit that is to be calibrated to a desired frequency. The calibration logic unit receives the comparator output and produces a component code to be used by the filter circuit in adjusting one or more component values in the filter circuit. The calibration logic unit further varies a gain of the variable-gain amplifier based on the comparator output. The DC voltage source produces the reference amplitude signal.

The Examiner rejected claim 1, stating that Gabara's monitoring circuit and tuning circuit are Applicants' comparator and calibration logic unit, respectively. The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed variable-gain amplifier, the calibration logic unit operable to vary a gain of the variable-gain amplifier based on the comparator output. The Examiner suggests, however, that variable gain amplifiers are well-known in the art, and "therefore, a person skilled in the art would easily incorporate this teaching [into Gabara] as for enhancing output signal quality." Applicants respectfully disagree. Applicants respectfully submit that there is no reasonable rationale for incorporating Applicants' variable gain amplifier into Gabara's filter.

Gabara shows a tunable bandpass filter. An input data signal 14 having a dominant frequency f_0 is applied to the filter. (Fig. 1; Abstract; col. 2, lines 66-67). A peak/power detector 20 measures the power magnitude of the filter output signal and passes the magnitude value to a monitoring circuit 34. (Fig. 1; Abstract; col. 3, lines 9-12). The monitoring circuit compares the current power magnitude value to the previously-measured power magnitude, and outputs a tuning signal reflecting this comparison to a finite state machine 36. (Col. 3, lines 13-17). The finite state machine adjusts the tuning signal until the power of the filter output signal is maximized. (Col. 3, lines 17-19). Maximum power indicates that the filter is tuned to the dominant frequency. (Fig. 2; Abstract).

The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara's tunable bandpass filter does not include Applicants' claimed variable-gain amplifier having a gain based on the comparator output. However, the Examiner suggests incorporating Applicants' variable-gain amplifier into Gabara's filter "for enhancing output signal quality." However, Gabara's tuning algorithm would not work properly if signals inside Gabara's filter were amplified based on the output of Gabara's "comparator" (i.e., monitoring circuit 34). Gabara's monitoring circuit compares the actual magnitude of the filtered signal's power to the signal's previous power magnitude. (Col. 3, lines 13-17). If the monitoring circuit determines, based on this comparison, that the current power is not maximized, Gabara's finite state machine adjusts the tuning signal appropriately. (Col. 3, lines 13-19). In other words, Gabara's tuning algorithm depends on the *actual ratio* of the

current and previously-measured signal powers. If Gabara's filter were to amplify signals based on the monitoring circuit's output, the comparison of the current and previous power values would cease to accurately represent the real-world deviance from maximum power, and – as the Examiner agreed during the above-summarized interview – Gabara's tuning method would not work. Therefore, no reasonable basis exists for incorporating Applicants' claimed variable gain amplifier into Gabara's filter circuit. *See, e.g., In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (no *prima facie* case of obviousness exists if the combination would render the prior art invention unsatisfactory for its intended purpose). Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable for at least these reasons.

Claims 2-14 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 3 is also separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 3 recites that the filter circuit includes an LC tank circuit. The Examiner points to Gabara's statement that "the performance of . . . inductor-capacitance ("LC") based circuits are tuned" as showing this limitation. In the first place, a simple LC circuit is not the same as an LC *tank* circuit: a tank circuit refers to a particular inductor-capacitor configuration, i.e., a parallel or series LC configuration. (*See Application*, para. [0005]). Additionally, nothing in Gabara suggests that Gabara's filter 12 *includes* an LC tank circuit. Indeed, the Examiner's cited passage expressly differentiates between "bandpass filter circuits [i.e., Gabara's bandpass filter] and *other circuits, such as inductor-capacitance ("LC") based circuits*." Gabara fails to teach or suggest a filter circuit that includes an LC tank circuit. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Claim 17 is also separately allowable for at least the following additional reasons. Claim 17 recites that the filter calibration circuit is operable to calibrate the filter circuit to the desired frequency without requiring a reduction in a quality factor of the filter circuit. The Examiner suggests that because Gabara shows "varying [the] center frequency not bandwidth, thus a quality factor is maintained." However, a filter's quality factor Q depends on the ratio of the center frequency to the bandwidth. (*See Application*, para. [0002]). Varying the center

frequency therefore directly affects the quality factor. By the Examiner's own acknowledgement, Gabara's filter varies the center frequency. Gabara's filter is consequently not operable to calibrate the filter circuit to the desired frequency without requiring a reduction in a quality factor. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

b. Claim 20 and its dependent claims

Claim 20 is directed to a filter calibration circuit that includes comparing means, code generating means, sourcing means and amplifying means. The comparing means generates a comparator output based on a filter output amplitude signal and a reference amplitude signal, the filter output amplitude signal corresponding to an amplitude of an output signal produced by a filtering means that is to be calibrated to a desired frequency. The code generating means receives the comparator output and produces a component code to be used by the filtering means in adjusting one or more component values in the filtering means. The code generating means further varies a gain of the amplifying means based on the comparator output. The sourcing means produces the reference amplitude signal.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed amplifying means, the code generating means operable to vary a gain of the amplifying means based on the comparator output. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, no reasonable rationale exists for incorporating Applicants' amplifying means into Gabara's filter. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is allowable over Gabara for at least these reasons.

Claims 21-33 and 35-37 depend from claim 20, and are allowable for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 20.

Claim 22 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given with respect to claim 3.

Claim 36 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given with respect to claim 17.

c. Claim 39 and its dependent claims

Claim 39 is directed to a method for calibrating a filter circuit that receives an input signal and produces a filtered output signal. The method includes generating a comparator output based on a filter output amplitude signal and a reference amplitude signal. The filter output amplitude signal corresponds to an amplitude of the filtered output signal at a desired frequency. The method further includes generating a component code based on the comparator output, adjusting one or more component values in the filter circuit based on the component code, producing a fixed DC reference amplitude signal, and varying a gain based on the comparator output.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest varying a gain based on the comparator output. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, no reasonable rationale exists for incorporating Applicants' claimed step of varying a gain into Gabara's method for calibrating a filter circuit. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 39 is allowable over Gabara for at least these reasons.

Claims 40-49 and 51-53 depend from claim 39, and are allowable for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 39.

Claim 52 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given with respect to claim 17.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. The Examiner rejected claims 15, 19, 34, 38, 50 and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabara. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have cancelled claims 15, 34, and 50 and have amended independent claims 1, 20, and 39 to include the limitations of claims 15, 34, and 50, respectively. Applicants therefore submit that the Examiner's rejection is moot. Applicants further submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the limitations of these claims for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39.

Claims 19, 38, and 54 recite compliance with IEEE standards 802.11, 802.11a, 802.11b, 802.11e, 802.11g, 802.11h, 802.11i, 802.11n, and 802.16. The Examiner acknowledges that

Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed limitations. However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that a filter calibration circuit compliant with IEEE standards is well-known in the art and suggests that "a person skilled in the art would easily incorporate this teaching as to increase the functionality."

Claims 19, 38, and 54 depend respectively from claims 1, 20, and 39, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 1, 20, and 39.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner's unsupported reasoning is insufficient to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 19, 38, and 54. For example, the Examiner has failed to state the manner in which this incorporation could be successfully accomplished. *See, e.g., KSR Intern. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007), *citing In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (stating that "rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness"). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 19, 38, and 54 are allowable for at least these additional reasons.

B. The Examiner rejected claims 55-92 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gabara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,766,150 ("Johnson"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

a. Claim 55 and its dependent claims

Claim 55 as amended is directed to a wireless transceiver including a transmitter that transmits a modulated carrier signal, the transmitter including a filter circuit that filters the modulated carrier signal, a calibration circuit that calibrates the filter circuit to a desired frequency, a DC voltage source, and a variable-gain amplifier. The calibration circuit includes a comparator and a calibration logic unit. The comparator generates a comparator output based on a filter output amplitude signal and a reference amplitude signal, the filter output amplitude signal corresponding to an amplitude of an output signal produced by the filter circuit. The calibration logic unit receives the comparator output and produces a component code to be used by the filter circuit in adjusting one or more component values in the filter circuit. The

calibration logic unit further varies a gain of the variable-gain amplifier based on the comparator output. The DC voltage source produces the reference amplitude signal.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed variable-gain amplifier, the calibration logic unit operable to vary a gain of the variable-gain amplifier based on the comparator output. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, no reasonable rationale exists for incorporating Applicants' variable-gain amplifier into Gabara's filter. Johnson fails to correct for this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 55 is allowable over the combination of Gabara and Johnson for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner also acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed wireless transceiver. The Examiner suggests that Johnson discloses a system for tuning a narrowband cavity filter in a CDMA transmitter and that it would have been obvious to "incorporate the [frequency] selection technique taught by Johnson into the art of Gabara as to use the filter circuit in a transmitter circuit to pass the desired signal efficiently." Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, Gabara performs frequency selection by maximizing the power of the filter output signal. In contrast, Johnson's filter performs frequency selection by *minimizing* the filter output signal. Specifically, Johnson's circuit includes a filter calibration controller that stores reference signal levels for various transmit frequencies in its internal software. (Col. 9, lines 35-39). If the signal level of Johnson's filter output does not match the stored signal level for a specified frequency, Johnson's controller decreases a control voltage until the signal level is minimized. (Col. 9, lines 59-62). Minimization of the filter output signal indicates that the filter is tuned to the center transmit frequency for the selected channel. (Col. 9, lines 62-65).

Certainly, no reasonable rationale exists – and the Examiner has pointed to no particular rationale – for incorporating a signal-minimizing frequency selection technique into a system that uses a *signal-maximizing* technique. To the contrary, Johnson's disclosure appears to teach away from Applicants' claimed invention. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the

Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the combination of Gabara and Johnson. Claim 55 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 55-68 and 69-74 depend from claim 54, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 54.

Claim 57 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 3.

Claim 71 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

b. Claim 74 and its dependent claims

Claim 74 as amended is directed to a wireless transceiver including transmitting means for transmitting a modulated carrier signal. The transmitting means includes a filtering means for filtering the modulated carrier signal, calibrating means for calibrating the filtering means to a desired frequency, sourcing means, and amplifying means. The calibrating means includes comparing means for generating a comparator output based on a filter output amplitude signal and a reference amplitude signal, the filter output amplitude signal corresponding to an amplitude of an output signal produced by the filtering means, and code generating means for receiving the comparator output and producing a component code to be used by the filtering means in adjusting one or more component values in the filtering means. The code generating means further varies a gain of the amplifying means based on the comparator output. The sourcing means produces the reference amplitude signal.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed amplifying means, the code generating means operable to vary a gain of the amplifying means based on the comparator output. As discussed above with respect to claim 1, no reasonable rationale exists for incorporating Applicants' amplifying means into Gabara's filter. Johnson fails to correct for this deficiency. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 74 is allowable over the combination of Gabara and Johnson for at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1.

The Examiner also acknowledges that Gabara fails to teach or suggest Applicants' claimed wireless transceiver. The Examiner suggests that it would have been obvious to combine Johnson with Gabara to meet this limitation. However, as discussed above, no reasonable rationale exists for incorporating the signal-minimizing frequency selection techniques of Johnson into Gabara's signal-maximizing technique. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to the combination of Gabara and Johnson. Claim 74 is allowable for at least these additional reasons.

Claims 75-87 and 88-92 depend from claim 74, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 74.

Claim 76 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 3.

Claim 90 is also separately allowable for at least the additional reasons given above with respect to claim 17.

Applicants petition for a one-month extension of time to respond to the instant action up to and including October 14, 2007. The fee in the amount of \$120 is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/16/07


Christina D. Jordan
Reg. No. 58,720

Customer No. 26200
Fish & Richardson P.C.
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500
Redwood City, California 94063
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071